

OPTIONS FOR CONDUCTING REVIEW
Developed by Subcommittee at February 26, 2004 meeting
With Participation of Stakeholders

<i>OPTIONS</i>	<i>CHARGE</i>	<i>FISCAL CONSIDERATONS</i>	<i>GROUP COMMENTS</i>
<p>Option A. COA in leadership role, form working group of 12-15 individuals to develop redesign plan over the next six to nine months.</p> <p>Working group will consist of: (a) Two reps from each of the three segments of higher ed chosen by segments; (b) Two reps from K-12 school districts or COEs that have CCTC-approved teacher ed programs; (c) 2 reps K-12 ed community, including teachers and administrators; (d) the COA (undetermined #); (e) 2 CCTC staff.</p> <p><i>Discussion identified desire to also include subject matter program and induction program representatives</i></p>	<p>At the direction of the Commission, the COA in consultation with stakeholders develop a process that involves all stakeholders in the study and redesign as well as identification of goals for the redesign process. COA would identify its preferred option for a process and goals of the review process, submit to the Commission for action.</p> <p>With COA in a leadership role, working group develops and implements a six to nine month workplan for completing the redesign. Workplan would take into consideration the existing framework, AIR evaluation, and contextual factors.</p> <p>Through staff, COA would provide regular reports to the Commission throughout the design process.</p> <p>Workgroup would present redesign options to the COA for action. COA to take redesign options to Commission for consideration and action.</p>	<p>Each segment represented on working group commits to supporting costs of their segmental participation in redesign process.</p>	<p><i>Structural Characteristics</i> Single working group responsible for much of the research, issue exploration, and eventual recommendations to go to the COA for consideration and action. COA to take final recommendations to the Commission.</p> <p><i>Advantages</i> Key stakeholders are included in a substantive way in the process.</p> <p>Workgroup members would be required to be vested with the authority to represent/speak on behalf of their institution, organization or constituency group.</p> <p>Workgroup members could identify areas requiring further expertise, establish ad-hoc subcommittees as needed, and bring various issues together in a holistic fashion.</p> <p>Establishing a single workgroup would be cost-efficient.</p> <p>Greater responsibility for review is placed on workgroup ensuring greater buy-in from stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i> Concerns raised over constitution of the workgroup. Some voiced support for including greater representation from K-12, including teachers and teacher groups.</p> <p>Connection to COA may need strengthening. Relationship of workgroup to COA needs to ensure on-going dialogue and discussion to ensure common goals and objectives.</p>

<i>OPTIONS</i>	<i>CHARGE</i>	<i>FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS</i>	<i>GROUP COMMENTS</i>
<p>Option B. COA in leadership role. Establish issue-oriented workgroups comprised of COA membership and stakeholders.</p> <p>Issue-oriented workgroups could either be comprised of the same stakeholders as proposed in options A and C (single accreditation study working group) or be supplemented by individuals with particular expertise.</p> <p>Combination of joint COA/workgroup meetings (4) and some workgroup apart from COA meetings. COA membership involvement in all workgroup meetings</p> <p>Four COA meetings with embedded workgroup meetings would be supplemented by additional workgroup meetings (held separate from COA meetings) One to two COA members would participate in all workgroup meetings.</p>	<p>At the direction of the Commission, the COA in consultation with stakeholders develop a process that involves all stakeholders in the study and redesign as well as identification of goals for the redesign process. COA would identify its preferred option for a process and goals of the review process, submit to the Commission for action.</p> <p>COA, in consultation with stakeholders would identify key issues needing attention during accreditation review. Issue-oriented workgroups comprised of stakeholders and COA members would be established to address topical areas.</p> <p>Issue-oriented workgroups would provide regular reports and redesign options to the COA throughout the design process. COA would be charged with “bringing” the work of the various issue-oriented groups together, in consultation with stakeholders. COA to take redesign options to Commission for consideration and action.</p>	<p>Commission resources to support four COA meetings required. Segmental representatives would support cost of their participation. Commission to cover the cost of 1-2 COA members on each workgroup for the separate workgroup meetings.</p>	<p><i>Structural Characteristics</i> Various issue-oriented workgroups would be responsible for research, issue exploration, and recommendations pertaining to the relevant topical areas. COA would be responsible for bringing the various issues together in a cohesive manner and ultimately, acting on proposed recommendations.</p> <p><i>Advantages</i> Because of the potentially large number of accreditation-related issues that may be involved in the review, workgroups focused on particular issues could simultaneously facilitate research and in-depth discussion of topics in an efficient manner.</p> <p>Experts from the field on the particular topics at hand could be tapped to provide unique perspectives and assistance.</p> <p>Embedding the meetings within COA meetings could provide some cohesiveness in goals and outcomes.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i> Utilizing numerous workgroups has significant cost implications – institutions would not be able to support representation on all workgroups.</p> <p>Embedded workgroup meetings would ensure some minimum level of cohesiveness, but ensuring a coherent product would prove challenging.</p> <p>Representatives on the various workgroups could provide significant input on a particular matter, but may not be empowered to speak on behalf of their system, institution or organization.</p> <p>Stakeholders expressed concern that this approach does not meet the spirit of Commission direction or COA approved motion for inclusiveness.</p> <p>Stakeholders would have limited role in “putting the pieces together” once the workgroups have completed their various charges.</p>

OPTIONS	CHARGE/PROCESS	FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS	GROUP COMMENTS
<p>Option C. Group Identified Preferred Option. COA in leadership role, form Accreditation Study Working Group of not more than 20 individuals to develop redesign plan over the next six to nine months.</p> <p>Exact constitution of work group and number from each group to be discussed further at the March 18 meeting of COA, but should consist of the following representatives: (a) Two representatives from each of the three segments of higher education chosen by segments; (b) Two representatives from K-12 school districts or COEs that have CCTC-approved teacher ed programs; (c) Two representatives from teaching profession – either teacher unions or practicing teachers (d) One representative from K-12 administrators (e) Four members of the COA; (f) One representative from subject matter programs (g) One representative from induction programs (h) CTC Staff</p>	<p>At the direction of the Commission, the COA in consultation with stakeholders develop a process that involves all stakeholders in the study and redesign as well as identification of goals for the redesign process. COA would identify its preferred option for a process and goals of the review process, submit to the Commission for action.</p> <p>With COA in a leadership role, Accreditation Study Working Group develop and implement a six to nine month workplan for completing the redesign. Workplan would take into consideration the existing framework, AIR evaluation, and contextual factors.</p> <p>Through staff, COA would provide regular reports to the Commission throughout the design process.</p> <p>Workgroup would present redesign options to the COA for action. COA to take redesign options to Commission for consideration and action.</p>	<p>Each segment represented on working group commits to supporting costs of their segmental participation in redesign process.</p> <p>Three to four COA meetings reserved for joint workgroup meeting.</p>	<p>Structural Characteristics Single working group responsible for much of the research, issue exploration, and identification of options for redesign to go to the COA for consideration and action. Workgroup would be co-facilitated by one COA representative and individual chosen by the stakeholders. Workgroup would operate on a consensus model. Where consensus is not reached, different perspectives will be reflected in documentation. Three to four joint meetings of working group and COA would be held to share ideas, perspectives, and facilitate common understandings and objectives.</p> <p>Advantages Key stakeholders are included in a substantive way in the process.</p> <p>Stakeholders would be required to be vested with the authority to represent/speak on behalf of their institution, organization or constituency group.</p> <p>Workgroup group could identify areas requiring further expertise, establish ad-hoc subcommittees as needed, and bring various issues together in a holistic fashion.</p> <p>Establishing a single workgroup would would be cost-efficient.</p> <p>Responsibility for review is placed on workgroup ensuring greater buy-in from stakeholders.</p> <p>Separate meetings of the workgroup (apart from COA) would maintain internal integrity of the group, while joint meetings would help ensure that COA and the workgroup are working toward common goals and objectives.</p> <p>Relationship of working group with COA would represent a mutually cooperative environment and would allow for on-going dialogue throughout the process.</p> <p>Inclusion of representative from induction and subject matter will ensure accreditation review takes into consideration pertinent issues related to pre and post educator preparation.</p>

